Debbie Beadle

From:

Evan Maxim

Sent:

Wednesday, October 17, 2012 1:28 PM

To:

Kamuron Gurol; Susan Cezar

Cc:

Kathy Curry; Carl de Simas; Debbie Beadle

Subject:

FW: New DRAFT Evaluation Form

EXHIBIT NO. QQ7

FYI

Evan Maxim Senior Planner City of Sammamish 425.295.0523

From: Evan Maxim

Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 10:10 AM

To: 'Reid Brockway'

Subject: RE: New DRAFT Evaluation Form

Reid,

I do not believe that the alternative form addresses all of the concerns you have expressed in your testimony. It does cover many of the practical concerns you have expressed.

For example, you mentioned an example below where the house separated by development (e.g. two other homes and improvements) from a stream does not provide habitat value. I think we will likely proposed requiring mitigation so we can show a net improvement to the buffer area (albeit in some cases a small net improvement).

I would suggest again, that the BAS we have in the record (recognizing your comments too), does not really support the thought that there is no value to the buffer separated by development. However, there may be other ways to pursue this line of thought, such as re-evaluating the policy balance between property use and environmental benefit. In short, identifying a policy basis other than BAS to support a further change here.

Regards,

Evan Maxim Senior Planner City of Sammamish 425.295.0523

From: Reid Brockway [mailto:waterat@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 6:46 AM

To: Evan Maxim

Subject: Re: New DRAFT Evaluation Form

Evan,

I, too, would be happy to work with you further on a solution that deals with all the inequities. The problem I have right now is the impending dismissal of my three amendments without knowing whether they need to be defended due to

the new amendment falling short of the mark. Do you have any further insight you can offer me on that account?

Note that I will be tied up today until about 11:00, after which I should be free to talk if you'd care to call me.

Thanks, Reid 868-7899

On 10/16/2012 5:13 PM, Evan Maxim wrote:

Reid,

If only we could have that kind of performance with the Seahawks all the time. Wow!

I would be happy to continue our conversation around this proposed alternative; I am pulled a number of different directions right now though. I think this will be more clear after the presentation on October 18 (at least the intent of the amendments), so my suggestion is that we set up a time to discuss this further after the 18th. We will have draft code in the relatively near future, and I suspect we can even continue our conversation as we approach the public hearing date.

Thoughts?

Regards,

Evan Maxim Senior Planner City of Sammamish 425.295.0523

From: Reid Brockway [mailto:waterat@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, October 15, 2012 9:49 AM

To: Evan Maxim

Cc: ECA

Subject: Re: New DRAFT Evaluation Form

Evan,

Good morning and welcome to another week. Hopefully the Seahawks made going back to work a little easier to take. :-)

Regarding your message below, is the additional description you are referring to what I find in the file "PC Eval Forms - follow up"? If so, I'm afraid it does not provide me with sufficient insight as to the city's intentions to know whether it constitutes a satisfactory alternative to proposed amendments 2-10, 2-11 and 2-12. I fear that it will not be due to some implied limitations.

For instance, it is one thing to "improve our flexibility", but if that does not eliminate the injustice of imposing restrictions where there is no environmental benefit, it is not really addressing the root problem that concerns me. For example, the file mentioned above states (under item 2-14c) that staff would be permitted (note: not required) to "authorize expansions of existing development to areas closer to regulated wetlands / streams, provided there was net improvement in wetland or stream buffer functions and values." Take expanding a house's footprint as an example. That implies that if the footprint of a house within 165 feet of a watercourse classified as a Type F stream is expanded toward that watercourse, mitigation is going to be required that improves a buffer even if that house is two lots

away from the watercourse with other houses and driveways in between. That is not reasonable or even feasible, as the real buffer (not the arbitrary 150 foot one) is on someone else's property. Further, that expansion of footprint may have no effect whatsoever on the watercourse or the band of viable habitat that exists along it, and the "flexibility" this description refers to is in reality a means of holding property rights hostage in the interest of making environmental gains.

The true solution to this problem is one that preserves and protects viable habitat in developed neighborhoods without imposing restrictions that are of no environmental benefit. Buffer delineation provides a means of accomplishing that. It is not clear to me what the implementation of 2-14c will entail. The devil is in the details, and until I understand how, or if, this new amendment will eliminate restrictions that provide no environmental benefit, I cannot endorse it as an alternative to buffer delineation.

Perhaps it would help for us to discuss this further. If so, I generally am available this week either by phone or in person.

Thanks, Reid 868-7899

On 10/11/2012 11:27 AM, Evan Maxim wrote:

Reid,

We will have some additional description of the approach in the material on Friday and we will provide more information at the meeting on the 18th.

Generally the topography is a harder one for us to find a solution on — in part because topography does not seem to affect the wildlife component (please recall that streams are regulated as Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas). However, on the building footprint constraint question, I do think we have some ideas on how to improve our flexibility, along the lines of our conversation last week.

More to follow. Regards,

Evan Maxim Senior Planner City of Sammamish 425.295.0523

From: Reid Brockway [mailto:waterat@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2012 10:41 AM

To: Evan Maxim

Subject: Re: New DRAFT Evaluation Form

Evan,

Thanks for the clarification. Would it make sense to wait for the Friday material before drawing any conclusions and providing feedback? For example, it's not clear how this new approach would deal with topography or with the building footprint constraint.

Reid

On 10/11/2012 10:16 AM, Evan Maxim wrote:

Reid,

We ended up generating forms for several "new" policy approaches – in the "2"s we had two new forms: 2-13c and 2-14c. 2-13c addresses a new proposed policy approach to wildlife habitat corridors that we think will be more practical. 2-14c, of course, addresses your concerns albeit through a different approach.

I think this will be clarified with the material coming out this Friday.

Regards,

Evan Maxim Senior Planner City of Sammamish 425.295.0523

From: Reid Brockway [mailto:waterat@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2012 9:21 AM

To: Evan Maxim

Subject: Re: New DRAFT Evaluation Form

Evan,

Thanks for the opportunity to review this. At first blush It looks like it could provide an adequate solution to the inequities that concern me (altho the devil is in the details). I will try to provide feedback to you today.

Out of curiosity, how did it get the number 2-14c? The highest number I find under Streams is 2-12. That's based on your memo of July 6. Nor is it in the Parking Lot list. Was there another memo I'm overlooking?

Thanks, Reid

On 10/10/2012 4:31 PM, Evan Maxim wrote:

Hi Reid,

We are preparing a new evaluation form based upon our conversation last week. As we discussed, attached is a DRAFT copy of the form for your review.

Regards,

Evan Maxim Senior Planner City of Sammamish 425.295.0523